

HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH : JABALPUR
DIVISION BENCH - SPL-I (Time 10:30 AM)

Daily Cause List dated : 18-02-2021

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA

Hearing through Video Conferencing

MOTION HEARING

[DIRECTION MATTERS]

SN	Case No	Petitioner / Respondent	Petitioner/Respondent Advocate
1	WP 22119/2011	LALIT MITTAL	SIDDHARTH GUPTA, S.K.GARG, ARJITA GUPTA, MUNISH SINGH, VIPIN SINGH
		Versus	
		THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH	ADVOCATE GENERAL, using 40 serverANKIT AGRAWAL[R-1][AG][R-2][AG][R-3][AG]
		LAND REVENUE , TENANCY & NAZUL-14600 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620	
		Relief - TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DT. 08.03.2010 PASSED BY THE RES. NO. 3. {FIXED DATE (ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER) COVID-19} TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING REFERENCE QUESTION:-WHETHER THE SETTLEMENT COMMISSIONER, COLLECTOR OR SETTLEMENT OFFICER, WHO HIMSELF HAS PASSED THE ORDER,THINKS IT NECESSARY TO REVIEW SUCH ORDER AND HAS TAKEN ADECISION TO REVIEW THE ORDER AND INITIATED REVIEW CASE THEN HIS SUCCESSOR IN OFFICE IS STILL REQUIRED TO SEEK SANCTION IN PASSING THE FINAL ORDER IN REVIEW CASE?OR WHETHER REVIEW PROCEEDINGS WHICH ARE INITIATED BY THE SAME REVENUE OFFICER WHO HAS PASSED THE ORDER UNDER REVIEW THAN THE SUCCESSOR IN OFFICE IS NOT REQUIRED TO SEEK SANCTION TO PASS FINAL ORDER?	
		01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND/OR 227 OF CONSTITUTION	

.....
TOTAL CASES : 1 (with connected matters)

PR (J) / R (J-I) / R(J-II)